

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|-----------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|--|---|--|-------------|
| 1 | 00 01 15 | 1.3.1 | | Volume 1 - G102 | Paragraph 1.3.1 of section 00 01 15 states "The coring report is included as part of the solicitation." Note 20 on sheet G102 of Volume 1 states "...Refer to the coring report for geotextile fabric depths." We have been unable to locate the coring report. Please provide the coring report. | Coring Report to be provided. | Yes | 0003 |
| 2 | Basis for award | | | | For the electrical project minum of \$5M was way too high, but that doesn't change the RFP requirement. | The requirement for a relevant electrical project will be amended to read, "The airfield lighting and electrical infrastructure portion of the project must be valued at approximately \$3M or greater". | Yes | 0003 |
| 3 | 800 | Factor 1 (i) (1) | 52 | NA | Does the lighting and electrical infrastructure portion apply to the 5,000 LF asphalt paving project, the 2,000 LF concrete paving project, both, or can it be emphasized in a separate project if needed? | Factor 1 refers to "For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as construction of a design-bid-build project to include construction experience on combined airfield paving and airfield lighting projects with a construction value of approximately \$10M and greater." | No | 0003 |
| 4 | 800 | Factor 1 (i) (1) | 53 | NA | We are requesting permission to eliminate all mention of design elements in the Construction Experience Project Data Sheet (Exhibit 1), as no design project(s) are required for this bid and it will lead to unused space on a form that is limited to two pages. | No, the form remain unchanged. | No | 0003 |
| 5 | 800 | Factor 1 (i) (1) | 52 | NA | A limitation of projects with \$5 million in runway lighting construction could considerably reduce the number of bidders on this project. We respectfully request that the threshold for runway lighting construction be lowered to \$3 million. | See response to PPI#2 | No | 0003 |

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------|---|---|--|-------------|
| 6 | Volume 1 Sheets C315-C506 | NA | 198 | C501 | Plan sheet C501 (198 of 203) OF Volume 1, Detail A3 shows 1" minimum milling on the runway and tapering to no milling on the outside edge of the runway shoulder. Is it required to mill the runway shoulder asphalt a minimum of 1" for the full width? | Refer to General Note 14 on sheet G102 of the construction plans. | No | 0003 |
| 7 | Volume 1 Sheets C315-C506 | NA | 131-186 | C344-C399 | The plan cross section sheets C344 through C399 (sheets 131-186 of 203) Volume 1 show existing and final grades for the interior pavement but do not give the grades for the outside edge although they are drawn. Please provide the existing and final grades for the outside edges of paving. | Refer to details on sheet C500 for shoulder cross slopes. | No | 0003 |
| 8 | Volume 1 Sheets C315-C506 | NA | 198 | C501 | Plan sheet C501 (198 of 203) Volume 1, Detail A1 shows milling a minimum of 1" below the existing geotextile fabric. From this detail it appears that the fabric is 1.25" below the surface. What is the actual depth of the fabric ? | Refer to General Note 20 on sheet G102 of the construction plans. The coring report to be provided. | No | 0003 |
| 9 | 00800 | Factor 1 (i) (1) | 52 | NA | The RFP requires 'construction projects that the offeror completed as prime contractor'. Since many runway and lighting projects are completed as Joint Ventures, can you be considered a 'Prime Contractor' on this RFP if you are a member of a Joint Venture on a relevant past project? | Yes. | No | 0003 |
| 10 | 00800 | Page 63 Wage Determinations | | | The referenced Wage Determinations are for Santa Rosa County. NAS Pensacola and Sherman Field are in Escambia County FL. Attaching the Wage Determinations for Heavy construction (rather than Highway) and for Building for Escambia County, request modification to contract and few days time extension to notify subcontractors | Corrected Wage Determinations for building and highway will be provided with Amendment 0002. | Yes | 0003 |
| 11 | | | | | Please provide the attendance sign-in sheet from the pre-bid site visit that was held on Friday, July 1, 2016. | Site Vist Rooster will be provided with amendment 0002 | Yes | 0001 |

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|-------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|---|---|--|-------------|
| 12 | | | | | Will the contractor be allowed to use the designated “Laydown Area” as a mobile asphalt plant site? Are there any other areas on the project site that the contractor will be allowed to use as a mobile asphalt plant site? | An asphalt mixing plant located onsite within the designated "Laydown Area" as identified in the contract plans will be permitted. Contractor will be responsible for obtaining all permits required for the onsite asphalt plant. The only area that has been identified for an onsite asphalt plant is the "Laydown Area" shown on the plans. Any other site must be approved by the Contracting Officer. | No | 0004 |
| 13 | 800 | 2 | 51 | NA | Section 00800 – Special Contract Requirements – In Evaluation Factors for Award, paragraph 2 item (1) vi indicates the requirement for Acknowledgement of the receipt of Amendments. Since the SF 1442 (required as item ii) already requires that item in paragraph 19, is that sufficient or should we include an additional separate listing here? | Offerors may either acknowledge amendments in paragraph 19 on the SF 1442 OR sign and submit each amendment with their price proposal. | No | 0003 |
| 14 | 800 | 2 | 51 | NA | Are Tabs required between the items I-VII in Volume I, and is an index required / requested? | Yes Tabs and an index are required. | No | 0003 |
| 15 | 800 | (i) | 54 | NA | Can the Safety Data Sheet (Exhibit 2) be expanded beyond 2 pages if additional space is required? | No. The page limitation will remain. | No | 0004 |
| 16 | 800 | (i) a. | 57 | NA | In Subfactor 4.A, the SF SF1420, DD2626 or equivalent is to be submitted for 'projects referenced under Factor 4 Past Performance'. Is it correct to assume you meant Factor 3- Past Performance? | Yes, breakout the small business past performance information from the Factor 3 past performance. | No | 0003 |
| 17 | 800 | (i) | 57 | NA | In Subfactor 4.A, it states that “Proposals including information on any of the following additional elements may be rated higher, based on the evaluated extent to which the information addresses the basis of evaluation in paragraph (ii):” and then proceeds to list 3 items. Since this is rated acceptable/unacceptable, how can it be rated higher? | This area of the factor will be removed with an amendment to the solicitation forthcoming. | No | 0003 |

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|---|-------------------|-------------|----------------|---|--|--|-------------|
| 18 | 800 | (b) | 52 | NA | Please identify where in Volumes I and/or II the Joint Venture agreement should be placed, if it applies. | Offeror shall place a copy of their Joint Venture agreement in Volume II, Non-Cost/Price (Technical) Proposal. See page 52 of 64 in the RFP for placement. (1) Cover Letter, (2) Index, (3) Factors (separately tabbed), (4) JV Agreements, (5) Letters from SBA for approved 8(a) Joint Venture (JV) & Mentor Protege Agreements, (6) Past Performance Questionnaires or completed CPARS evaluations. | No | 0003 |
| 19 | 800 | Subfactor 4.A, a. | 57 | NA | In Subfactor 4.A, PE ratings(SF1420, DD2626) and SF294s or ISRs are required for Factor 3 projects. If the projects are for private/public airports they will not have these documents. Some potential past project candidates may not have these documents as they are private/public airport projects. In past projects with similar requirements, NAVFAC allowed us to substitute project subcontractor performance on projects of similar scope performed as the prime contractor. Will that be allowed here? | This area of the factor is going to be amended where the offeror will be able to substitute small business past performance information only in the areas from Factor 3 where the offeror was a subcontractor versus the prime. Be sure to identify in your proposal that you are substituting the small business past performance with a similar project in size, complexity, and scope. | No | 0003 |
| 20 | Contract clause FAR 52.248, Value Engineering, with Alt 1 | | | | If a VECP is anticipated, does this need to be submitted with the contractor's proposal, which would allow a lower bid going in? If the VECP does need to be submitted with the proposal, putting all bidders on the same playing field, we request a 2 weeks extension to the proposal due date in order to prepare the VECP | Alt I is deleted with Amendment 0003. Value Engineering Change Program is voluntary. | No | 0003 |

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|-------------|
| 21 | Airfield lighting drawings/specs | | | | <p>In reviewing current FAA Advisory Circular AC 150/5345_53D, dtd June 3, 2016, we consistently find the following language regarding LED lighting at airfields: (L) Indicates LED fixture. Any fixture listed above that uses a LED lighting source may not be compatible with Enhanced Flight Vision Systems that use IR energy emissions for imaging. (###*) IR element present is not tested nor certified under this program as to compatible with any night vision equipment.</p> <p>There are many non-LED lighting systems that are approved by FAA. Is the Government aware of the wording above in the FAA Circular. To our knowledge most aircraft (including Blue Angels) that use Sherman Field have night vision equipment. Please advise if the Government wishes us to continue to bid LED lighting and will hold us harmless if we install per the specs but the lighting causes pilot loss of control.</p> | NAS Pensacola does not have a mission requirement for NVGs | No | 0004 |
| 22 | SF 1442 RFP | | 1 | | <p>Response date for the RFP is currently July 20, 2016. It is not possible for us to prepare an estimate by that date. Previous commitments won't allow it. Please postpone the bid date until August 4, 2016.</p> | See amendment 0003 | No | 0003 |
| 23 | | | | ES121-3 through ES177-1 | <p>General Note 1 on most plan sheets states "New cable and isolation transformer shall be installed for all taxiway lights. Reuse existing conduits in areas where new base cans are not installed". Note 1 is not called out on these plans, yet there are hundreds of existing taxiway lights shown in "grey" as existing on multiple sheets. See Sheet ES146-2 for example. Are the taxiway circuits and transformers on the lower half of the page to be replaced? If so, what is the circuit layout? How many circuits are there? How do they run? Without this information we can not determine cable quantities? Please clarify and provide additional information if all taxiway circuits and transformers are to be replaced.</p> | <p>The items in gray (shaded) are items that are not done in this phase or project. They are shown for background reference to show that they are existing. The work on the drawings for the Contractor is the work shown in black line (bold). Note 1 was included on many sheets, but it is bold on those sheets where it covers work on the sheet. On sheets where the note is shaded, the note does not identify work for the Contractor on that sheet.</p> | No | 0004 |

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|--|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|-------------|
| 24 | | | | ES121-3 through ES177-1 | Please provide whole site airfield plans showing series circuit routes for each runway edge light, taxiway, PAPI, Threshold, DM, and sign circuit so cable quantities can be determined. | See Drawings ES605 and ES606. Each line on the tables on these sheets is a calculation of the loading on the constant current regulator for the respective circuit. The tables show estimated quantities of series circuit cable lengths, light fixtures and signs. | No | 0004 |
| 25 | Amendment 0002 | a. 2. | 2 | NA | What is the date that the Base Access Form is due? Also, will the site visit be at 0900 Central Time, or Eastern? | For the site visit the base access form is 07/18/2019. Site Visit is Central Time | No | 0004 |
| 26 | 800 | Factor 1 (i) (1) | 52 | NA | Are RFP-relevant past projects from subcontractors and/or team members (non-JV) permissible if they meet bid criteria and were prime contractors on the contract? | No teaming arrangements are not allowed. | No | 0004 |
| 27 | | | | | I have been searching the NECO website for this solicitation and could not find the NAVFAC UFGS Airfield Lighting written specification Section 34 43 00. 00 20 posted on the website. Only see the Div 1 and Div 2 specs. Can you confirm that they are posted on your website and where they are shown, please. I see many drawings, but this is not my forte and am looking for the written specification that I would expect to accompany this solicitation. | Spec Section 34 43 00.00 20 to be provided by Amendment. | Yes | 0004 |
| 28 | Div 2 specs, Section 32 12 13.15, at 2.2.1, Asphalt Mixing Plant | 2.2.1, Asphalt Mixing Plant | | | The spec references conformance with AASHTO M 156 for requirements of the asphalt mixing plant. Will the government allow a mobile asphalt mixing plant to be set up on NAS Pensacola to satisfy the AASHTO M 156 requirement? | See response to PPI#12. | No | 0004 |

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|--------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|---|--|--|-------------|
| 29 | PPI Log 2016/07/12 | Question 3 | 1 | NA | We are requesting clarification on the answer to PPI #3. The question we are asking is - may we submit projects with only asphalt paving that meets the criteria, or a project with only concrete paving that meets the criteria, or a project with only airfield lighting in it to satisfy the requirement, or is it the case that each relevant project must have a combination of paving and airfield lighting? If the answer is yes, a relevant project must have a combination of both paving and airfield lighting, must the paving and airfield lighting meet the LF/dollar threshold of both Asphalt and Concrete Paving requirements in addition to electrical lighting requirements on every project? | All criteria of Factor 1-Experience apply. Each relevant project shall include airfield paving and airfield lighting. The dollar value of the combined project must be met and the components of the project must meet the minimum requirements of having either asphalt or concrete paving with the minimum airfield electrical requirements. As noted, all values are approximate. | No | 0004 |
| 30 | PPI Log 2016/07/12 | Question 19 | 4 | NA | We are requesting clarification on the answer to PPI #19. In Factor 1 (and by flow down, Factor 3), we are only allowed to provide 'projects that the offeror completed as the Prime Contractor'. However, the requirements in Factor 4 have been changed to say 'Substitute small business past performance information only in the areas from Factor 3 where the offeror was a subcontractor versus the prime'. By the requirements in Factor 1 (which flow to Factor 3), there are no submitted projects where we are allowed to be a subcontractor. The question is - if the contract is not a Federal Procurement, but for agencies or private entities that do not require ISRs of 254s, may we substitute the small business past performance with a similar project in size, complexity, and scope? | See Factor Revision solicitation Amendment 0004. | No | 0004 |
| 31 | Amendment 0003 | NA | 7 | NA | Required items were deleted in Subfactor 4A requiring information on small business awards, Mentor Protégé Agreements, and CRP programs. However, the evaluation criteria does not appear to be amended to reflect that. Can we assume that the references to AbilityOne, Mentor Protégé Agreements and other socio-economic programs are to be deleted as the requirements to submit information based upon them have been deleted? | See Factor Revision solicitation Amendment 0004. | No | 0004 |

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------|---|--|---|--|-------------|
| 32 | Appendix B (Boring Locations) | N/A | | B-1 Overall Coring Location Plan, ShtsC100 through C130 | Note 20 on drawing G102 states "This project will require the removal of geotextile fabric during milling operations in areas identified on the plan sheets. The contractor shall remove the geotextile fabric and mill a minimum of 1" below the fabric. Refer to the Coring Report for Geotextile Fabric depths.". Drawings C100 through C130, (Existing Condition and Demolition Plan) designate areas to "Mill ACC Pavement and Demolish Geotextile Fabric". The coring report lists the location of cores by Northing and Easting and designates in which cores fabric was found. Cores B-16, B-59, B-89 and B-144 all indicate that fabric was present in the cores but the cores are not located within an area designated on the plans to demolish Geotextile Fabric. Does this additional geotextile fabric need to be removed? If so, what are the limits of the fabric removal represented by these 4 cores? | The location of the geotextile fabric identified in cores B-16, B-59, B-89 and B-144 should not interfere with milling operations and therefore do not need to be removed. Add to note 20 on sheet G102 : It is unknown whether the geotextile fabric is woven or non-woven. The contractor is to assume that the geotextile fabric is not millable. | No | 0004 |
| 33 | Spec Volume 2 32 01 13.00 20 | 2.1, 2.2 | 32 | N/A | Section 2 of specification section 32 01 13.00 20, Emulsified Asphalt Seal Coats without Aggregate, specifies two products for seal coating. Paragraph 2.1 specifies Emulsified Asphalt for Conventional Sealcoat and paragraph 2.2 specifies (GSB-88) Cationic Emulsion of Gilsonite Ore. Which product should be used for the seal coat work under this specification section? | Contractor is allowed to choose either emulsified asphalt for conventional seal coat or cationic emulsion of gilsonite ore. | No | 0004 |
| 33 | Volume 1 Sheets T100 - C314 | NA | 5 | G103 | Plan sheet G103 (SHEET 5 of 203) of Volume 1 apparently shows Arresting Gear Road between and parallel to the 7-25 runways from the begining of the western overruns to approximately station 12+50 and from approximately station 66+50 to the end of the eastern overruns. These access roads are not shown on the GEOMETRIC AND MARKING PLAN sheets or on the GRADING PLAN sheets. Are these roads to be constructed under this contract? If so please provide a plan and stationing. | The access roads shown on sheet G103 are to be constructed under this contract. Refer to note 24 on Sheet G102. | No | 0004 |

The PPI log is for informational purposes only. It does not amend the RFP. If a revision to the RFP is required, a formal amendment will be issued.

| PPI # | RFP Section | Paragraph Number | Page Number | Drawing Number | Question | Government Response | RFP / Solicitation Attachment Provided Yes or No | ACQ Amend # |
|-------|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|-------------|
| 34 | | | | ES121-3 through ES177-1 | Please provide whole site airfield plans showing series circuit routes for each runway edge light, taxiway, PAPI, Threshold, DM, and sign circuit so cable quantities can be determined. | See Response to PPI#24. | No | 0005 |
| 35 | 26 41 00 Lightning Protection | | | | Where does this section apply? | Spec Section 34 43 00.00 20 provided by Amendment #4 to replace spec section 26 41 00. | No | 0005 |
| 36 | | | | ES500 & ES501, Detai A1 | Detail is confusing. Is the bare can to be installed (upper half)covered with earth and not concrete if the Paved Shoulder Option is not awarded? See note 2. Please clarify the intent of note 2. | If the option to construct the hard surface shoulders is not awarded at this time, then the adjacent area will be turfed. The base can will again be set as shown in detail A1 with the elevation of the top to be determined from the Volume 1 pavement drawings as before. The area adjacent to the completed base can should be graded up to match the elevation of the top of the base can and the concrete and rebar collar. After the finish grading is completed, the wood cover can be removed, and the light fixture, transformer and cables installed. | No | 0005 |
| 37 | Can't find it | | | | Is the contractor to include the fee for Spawar/Edgecomb Systems to update the airfield lighting controls in their proposal? Or is that cost handled directly by the Navy? | Note 1 on EP100-2 points to the airfield lighting control cabinet, key note 23, and indicates that: 1. NEW AIRFIELD LIGHTING CONTROLS SHALL BE UPDATED BY SPAWAR. | No | 0005 |
| 38 | 03 30 53 | 2.2.1.1 | 6 | NA | Paragraph 2.2.1.1 states that Type V concrete is required for ready mix concrete. Both of our ready mix concrete suppliers in Pensacola have declined to quote this product. Type V cement is not available in the Pensacola area. Only standard types I and II are available. If type V were available it would cost twice as much as Type I, increasing the project cost by at least \$500,000.00. Type V cement is for areas with high sulfates. We assume this is an error in the specification and that Type 1 cement in readymix concrete is acceptable. Please advise if that is not the case. | Portland cement Type I or II low alkali is acceptable. | Yes | 0006 |